

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Undersigned thanks the Examiner for granting the Applicant a telephonic-interview. In view of the telephonic-interview, Claims have been presented in a form believed to be preferred by the Examiner. It is respectfully submitted and earnestly believed to be apparent that the *cited art* does not teach or suggest the claimed combination of: a sending antenna case (labeled as (b) in Claim 1), a plurality of receiving antenna cases around the antenna case (labeled as (c) in Claim 1), and a main unit case separated from the sending antenna case and the receiving antenna cases, and including a receiving synthesis unit, wherein the receiving synthesis unit is operable to perform diversity receiving with respect to a plurality of receiving antennas (labeled as (d) in Claim 1). Claims 1, 6 and 7 recite these features and are therefore patentable over the *cited art*.

The following remarks summarize the substance of the telephonic-interview and fully traverse the Examiner's rejection for the record.

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner has rejected Claims 1 and 3-6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,903,834 (*Wallstedt et al.*) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0102198 (*Diener*). The Examiner has rejected Claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over *Wallstedt et al.* in view of *Diener* and U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0185287 (*Ogawa*).

The Finality and substance of the Examiner's rejection is fully traversed below for at least the following reasons:

**(A) A RECEIVING SYNTHESIS UNIT THAT IS CONNECTED TO EACH ONE OF A PLURALITY OF RECEIVING ANTENNAS BY WIRED CABLE AND PERFORMS DIVERSITY RECEIVING WITH RESPECT TO RECEIVED RADIO FREQUENCY SIGNALS FROM A PLURALITY OF RECEIVING ANTENNAS AROUND A SENDING ANTENNA FOR RECEIVING RADIO FREQUENCY SIGNAL FROM A TERMINAL DEVICE LOCATED BETWEEN A SENDING ANTENNA AND THE RECEIVING ANTENNAS (CLAIM 1)**

Claim 1 recites:

(i) "a plurality of receiving antennas around the sending antenna operable to receive the radio frequency signal from a terminal device located between the sending antenna and the receiving antennas" and

(ii) “wherein the receiving synthesis unit is connected to each one of the plurality of receiving antennas by the wired cable and performs diversity receiving with respect to the received radio frequency signals from the plurality of receiving antennas”

As such, claim 1 clearly and concisely recites: *a receiving synthesis unit that is connected to each one of a plurality of receiving antennas by wired cable and performs diversity receiving with respect to received radio frequency signals from the plurality of receiving antennas* (see (i) above) *around a sending antenna for receiving radio frequency signal from a terminal device located between a sending antenna and the receiving antennas* (see (ii) above).

In the Final Office Action, instead of addressing this claimed feature and responding to the Applicant remarks regarding the claimed feature, the Examiner has merely asserted that the claimed feature is “not recited exactly” in the claims (Final Office Action, page 2).

Clearly, this claimed feature has been recited in claim 1. As such, it is very respectfully submitted that the Finality of the Office Action is improper and should be withdrawn.

Applicant reiterates the arguments submitted to the Examiner and again respectfully submits that *Diener et al.* and *Wallstedt*, taken alone, or in any proper combination, do not teach or suggest the claimed feature.

More particularly, the Examiner has again asserted that *Wallstedt* teaches: a receiving synthesis unit that is connected to a receiving antenna by wired cable and performs diversity receiving with respect to received radio frequency signals (Final Office Action, page 4, citing Col. 6, lines 50-60 of *Wallstedt*). Again, it is noted that *Wallstedt* states that a “[b]lock 29 performs diversity combining of the signals received on the appropriate channel from the appropriate RAD” (Col. 6, lines 59-61). However, it is apparent that this teaching or general knowledge of diversity receiving does not properly address the claimed feature.

**(B) A CONFIGURATION OF MULTIPLE RECEIVING ANTENNA UNITS, EACH RESPECTIVELY IN A PLURALITY OF RECEIVING ANTENNA CASES EFFECTIVELY PROVIDED AROUND A SENDING ANTENNA AND OPERABLE TO CONVERT RECEIVED RADIO FREQUENCY SIGNAL INTO DIGITAL SIGNAL FOR TRANSMISSION TO A RECEIVING SYNTHESIS UNIT THAT PERFORMS DIVERSITY RECEIVING WITH RESPECT TO THE RADIO FREQUENCY SIGNALS RECEIVED AT THE ANTENNA CASES (CLAIM 7)**

Claim 7 recites:

(i) “a plurality of receiving antenna cases around the sending antenna case, wherein each of the plurality of receiving antenna cases includes a receiving antenna unit and a receiving conversion unit, wherein the receiving antenna unit operable to receive a radio frequency signal from the terminal device, and wherein the receiving conversion unit operable to convert the radio frequency signal received by the receiving antenna unit into a digital signal for transmitting to the information processing unit; and

(ii) wherein the information processing unit includes a receiving synthesis unit that performs diversity receiving with respect to the radio frequency signal received at the plurality of receiving antenna cases” (see, for example, Figures 1 and 2 of the present application, and in particular, Figure 1 depicting receiving antenna cases 300a, 300b, 300c and 300b and a sending antenna case 200, and Figure 2 depicting in greater detail sending and receiving antenna cases).

As such, Claim 7 clearly and consciously recites:

*a configuration of multiple receiving antenna units each respectively in a plurality of receiving antenna cases provided around a sending antenna and operable to convert received radio frequency signal into digital signal for transmission (see (i) above) to a receiving synthesis unit that performs diversity receiving with respect to the radio frequency signals received at the antenna cases (see (ii) above).*

In other words, Claim 7 recites a configuration of multiple (or plurality of) receiving antenna units respectively in *a plurality of receiving antenna cases effectively provided around a sending antenna for diversity receiving*.

It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has not addressed the claimed configuration of *a plurality of receiving antenna cases effectively provided around a sending antenna for diversity receiving* in the Final Office Action. As such, it is very respectfully submitted that the Finality of the Office Action is improper for an additional reason and should be withdrawn.

Applicant reiterates the arguments submitted to the Examiner and again respectfully submits that *Diener et al.* and *Wallsted*, taken alone, or in any proper combination, do not teach or suggest the claimed feature.

In fact, as the Applicant has noted, in stark contrast to the claimed invention, *Wallstedt* teaches using multiple RADs capable of both sending and receiving for diversity receiving. As such, it is respectfully submitted that *Wallstedt* teaches away from the specific claimed configuration recited in Claim 7 and consequently *Wallstedt* cannot be combined with any other reference to teach the invention recited in the Claim 7.

It should be noted that Claim 6 recites similar features as those discussed above and is therefore believed to be patentable over *Diener et al.* and *Wallstedt*, taken alone, or in any proper combination.

### CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the cited art of record. Additional limitations recited in the independent claims or the dependent claims are not further discussed because the limitations discussed above are sufficient to distinguish the claimed invention from the cited art. Accordingly, Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner.

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should any fee be required for any reason related to this document, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge said fee to Deposit Account No. 504481, referencing Docket No. MES1P093. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,  
BEYER LAW GROUP LLP

/RMahboubian/  
R. Mahboubian  
Registration No. 44,890

P.O. Box 1687  
Cupertino, CA 95015-1687  
(408) 255-8001